

PICTURES GO; ENGLAND WAILS

AMERICAN MULTIMILLIONAIRE AS AN ART GALLERY

Even the National Loan Collection at Grafton Galleries, a Heir to the Spoils of the Nation, is not exempted from the death duties which will soon be levied on the collection.

Special Cable Despatch to THE SUN.
LONDON, Oct. 9.—From time to time some fine picture or other historic work of art comes to public notice in England. Whenever this happens, there is a humorous pathetic outpouring of lamentation in the English press, and the precious possession's certain fate is wept over with bitter tears. A transatlantic voyage is at once assumed to be its doom.

The celebration of this artistic wake is as sad enough when the anticipated sailing of one old master, one ancient folio, is lamented, but this week there has been a weeping lamentation for a galleryful of ancient masters. Oddly enough the gallery in question has been filled entirely with the view to helping Britain keep her art treasures at home.

The trustees of the National Gallery have collected "a national loan exhibition" of great works of art and have housed them in the Grafton Galleries, where for a year to come they hope to collect entrance fees from the public sufficient to form the nucleus of a fund which will enable them to purchase for the country pictures which otherwise would be sold to those artistic ogres, "the American multi-millionaires."

But before the Grafton Galleries doors were opened, the wailing of lamentation was heard in the land. Britains weeping for her pictures and refusing to be comforted, because they are sure to be sold to American millionaires. The newspapers and reviews, daily and weekly, unanimously declare that the exhibition instead of helping to keep the treasures at home, has simply collected them in convenient fashion for certain emigration to the United States.

"The National Loan Exhibition," weeps the *Saturday Review*, "is a cry of distress. The trustees of the National Gallery invite the public to inspect the collected treasures as though they said: 'Come and look your last. Before long these precious possessions will in the inevitable course of things have vanished from your shores. We are helpless and cannot do anything to save them.'"

The *Review* rejoices that Lewis Harcourt, First Commissioner of Works, has promised on behalf of the Government that works of art will be exempt in the future from death duties, but it rejoices sadly, for it knows that this is insufficient. Then come mention of the "American multi-millionaire," with such wealth as an Englishman can never hope to possess, and the statement that "unless the State funds are made adequate the destination of our pictures is America."

Mr. Harcourt opened the exhibition at the Grafton Galleries. He made an interesting speech despite snuff-taking interruptions. Among the Americans who were noticed admiring the priceless masterpieces in the collection were Mmes. Burns and Harcourt, Cora, Countess of Strathford; the Duchess of Marlborough; and Countess Pappenheim.

The only important social event of the week was a musical and dramatic matinee for the benefit of the Epileptic Hospital, given in Persian Court, which Bleed Sutton, the famous physician, has built back of his London house. The court is an exact reproduction of the ruined court of Artaxerxes at Shushan, with marble floors and lotus-bearing pillars. The entertainment, which included songs and recitations by Mmes. Kendal and Albanesi and Mr. H. B. Irving, was excellent. Many Americans who are temporarily in town were present, among them Lady Granard and Mmes. Goudy, De Bonnes, L. Harcourt and Drexel and the Misses Drexel and Post.

Mrs. Willoughby d'Eresby has gone to Wynn Park as the guest of Lady Londonderry. Lady Granard is spending the week end at Englefield. Mrs. John Ward, daughter of Ambassador Reid, has gone into her new house at Chilton Lodge, Hungerford, which has been thoroughly renovated.

Mr. Van Allen will have his first shooting party at Rushton Lodge next week. It will be an English gathering. Great sport is anticipated as there are plenty of birds on the estate.

Mr. and Mrs. Bradley Martin are entertaining the Marquis of Dufferin at Belmacan this week end.

Mrs. John Jacob Astor gave a luncheon in Paris to a party of Americans which included Mrs. Charles Carroll and Miss Gwendolen Burden.

Secretary Ridgely Carter of the American Embassy has had his father as a guest during the week.

Mrs. Clomda, wife of the Military Attaché of the American Embassy, is back again in her London residence.

NO JOKE TO BE A MARSHAL

McGrath, Who Says He's a Deputy, Got 28 Wounds Within 12 Hours.

Michael McGrath of Elizabethport, N. J., was found last night at First Avenue and Fifty-seventh street, Bay Ridge, badly beaten and with a number of stab wounds on his body. He told the doctors at the Norwegian Hospital that he was a deputy United States marshal of about twelve hours standing and that he had been beaten while he was performing his duty. McGrath's story was that during the summer he had been employed on the excursion steamer J. S. Warden, George Beebe captain, on a tour of the coast, and that he was on the coast when he was beaten. McGrath said he had been beaten by a man named Marshall, who he said was a deputy United States marshal. McGrath said he had been beaten by Marshall while he was performing his duty as a deputy United States marshal.

McGrath's story was that during the summer he had been employed on the excursion steamer J. S. Warden, George Beebe captain, on a tour of the coast, and that he was on the coast when he was beaten. McGrath said he had been beaten by a man named Marshall, who he said was a deputy United States marshal. McGrath said he had been beaten by Marshall while he was performing his duty as a deputy United States marshal.

McGrath's story was that during the summer he had been employed on the excursion steamer J. S. Warden, George Beebe captain, on a tour of the coast, and that he was on the coast when he was beaten. McGrath said he had been beaten by a man named Marshall, who he said was a deputy United States marshal. McGrath said he had been beaten by Marshall while he was performing his duty as a deputy United States marshal.

McGrath's story was that during the summer he had been employed on the excursion steamer J. S. Warden, George Beebe captain, on a tour of the coast, and that he was on the coast when he was beaten. McGrath said he had been beaten by a man named Marshall, who he said was a deputy United States marshal. McGrath said he had been beaten by Marshall while he was performing his duty as a deputy United States marshal.

McGrath's story was that during the summer he had been employed on the excursion steamer J. S. Warden, George Beebe captain, on a tour of the coast, and that he was on the coast when he was beaten. McGrath said he had been beaten by a man named Marshall, who he said was a deputy United States marshal. McGrath said he had been beaten by Marshall while he was performing his duty as a deputy United States marshal.

McGrath's story was that during the summer he had been employed on the excursion steamer J. S. Warden, George Beebe captain, on a tour of the coast, and that he was on the coast when he was beaten. McGrath said he had been beaten by a man named Marshall, who he said was a deputy United States marshal. McGrath said he had been beaten by Marshall while he was performing his duty as a deputy United States marshal.

McGrath's story was that during the summer he had been employed on the excursion steamer J. S. Warden, George Beebe captain, on a tour of the coast, and that he was on the coast when he was beaten. McGrath said he had been beaten by a man named Marshall, who he said was a deputy United States marshal. McGrath said he had been beaten by Marshall while he was performing his duty as a deputy United States marshal.

THE RAYMOND DIVORCE SUIT

Chief Justice Gummere Said to Have Been a Witness in His Daughter's Death

It became known in Newark yesterday that testimony was taken in the divorce case begun by the wife of ex-Judge Thomas L. Raymond, who is now First Assistant Prosecutor of Essex county, N. J., which came up for hearing before Bennett Van Dyke, sitting as special master, in the Chancery chamber in Newark on Wednesday. The hearing was in secret and was ex parte, Mr. Raymond having put in no defense, and he was not represented by counsel or otherwise.

Besides the testimony of Mrs. Raymond testimony was given by her father, who is Chief Justice William S. Gummere of New Jersey, Dr. Edward J. Ill of Newark and the petitioner's sister. Because of the fact that the hearings were held in secret only little of the testimony became known.

Desertion is the ground on which the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

The testimony given by Chief Justice Gummere was as to the marriage and about Mrs. Raymond leaving her husband and coming back to live with him on his advice and solicitation.

The charge of desertion was based on the alleged refusal of Judge Raymond to live with his wife as her husband for practically the whole period of their married life of more than two years. It was set up by Judge Coleman of Jersey City, county of Raymond, and such a refusal constituted desertion in the view of the New Jersey laws.

X-SCIENCE HERETICS WARNED

SIXTEEN RAN COUNTER TO MRS. EDDY'S TEACHINGS.

Cards of Eight Are Dropped From the "Journal"—The Others Are Lesser Offenders—They Followed Mrs. Stetson Into Error. It Is Explained.

"It's a housecleaning," said Eugene H. Cox, head of the New York Christian Science publication committee, when he was asked yesterday to explain the "ammonishing" of sixteen Christian Science practitioners who had been pupils under Mrs. Augusta Stetson, the recently deceased head of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, in this city.

"This long have these practitioners of Mrs. Stetson's teaching been allowed to continue in methods of healing which are not of Christian Science as set forth in 'Science and Health, With a Key to the Scriptures,' which is in itself a statement of the Christian Science faith," Mr. Cox continued. "The significance of the move made by the board of directors of the Mother Church in disciplining these practitioners is twofold.

"For the sixteen who have been disciplined it means that if they wish to continue practicing their statements as to the doctrine as set forth in 'Science and Health,' for the public at large the significance lies in the fact I have already stated, that this is a housecleaning and that efforts have been made to remedy an error which has existed too long."

Mr. Cox issued a typewritten statement from his office at 1 Madison avenue yesterday afternoon which set forth the names of the practitioners allied with Mrs. Stetson who have been disciplined by the officers of the First Church in Boston and which gave the reasons for the action.

In this statement a distinction is made between eight of Mrs. Stetson's pupils who have had their professional cards dropped from the Christian Science Journal and eight lesser offenders who have been admonished as regards their conduct but who are still on probation as practitioners. The statement follows:

"The action of the board of directors of the First Church of Christ, Scientist, of Boston in removing the cards of certain practitioners from the Christian Science Journal was based upon the testimony of the twenty-five selected students of Mrs. Augusta Stetson who were recently examined by this board. The following named persons were admonished and their cards ordered removed from the Journal: Miss Sarah W. Hathaway, Mrs. Augusta Buckman, Miss Margaret Duncan, Mrs. Letitia H. Greene, Arnold Blome, Hayne Davis, Harry E. Fink and Stuart C. Rowbotham.

In addition to the above named persons the following were admonished, most of them not having cards in the Journal: Mrs. Amelia S. Rowbotham, Miss Lily Pope, Miss Mary E. Pearson, Mrs. Anna M. Peck, Mrs. Mary Freshman, Miss Josie Colby, Miss Sylvia Rose and Arthur G. Overybury. The reasons for admonishing the sixteen persons was that their testimony showed that they were practicing Christian Science according to the statement thereof in its text book, 'Science and Health, With a Key to the Scriptures.' The by-laws of the Church require that such admonition be given before discipline is taken. The removal of the cards from the Journal is not considered to be discipline, but rather a step toward the proper public acknowledgment of error, which might be called irregular or ignorant practice.

Mr. Cox explained that of the latter eight who were named in his statement there were only two practitioners who had cards in the Journal, Mrs. Stetson and Amelia S. Rowbotham and Arthur E. Overybury. Their cards have not been withdrawn, since the degree of their admonition is not as great as that applying to the first eight.

The amount of punishment visited upon these sixteen is not as great as that imposed upon Mrs. Stetson, whose card was revoked, she was forbidden to undertake the work of a teacher of Christian Science until the fitness of her work should be approved by the board of directors in the by-laws of the Church, and besides all this she was admonished by the directors. This might be counted as discipline, Mr. Cox said.

The chief complaint against those who have been 'ammonished' by the directors of the Boston church, as Mr. Cox explained yesterday, was that they had strayed from the path of right teaching, and under the influence of Mrs. Stetson.

"The principles of Christian Science as set forth in 'Science and Health, With a Key to the Scriptures,' are as clear and direct as mathematics," he said. "The higher Christian Science is based upon first principles as inflexible as the higher formulae of mathematics. If one deviates in the least from the primal principle of Christian Science he does not believe in nor teach the truth of Christian Science teachings. What these sixteen practitioners have been teaching, so the board of directors learned upon examination of them, has not been Christian Science because, following the lead of Mrs. Stetson, they erred in some of the fundamental truths of the doctrine, and in this case the board erred they too should fall into error.

"There is nothing personal either in this action against the sixteen practitioners or in that against Mrs. Stetson. These practitioners were not admonished because they were pupils of Mrs. Stetson but because they were not practicing Christian Science, nor were Mrs. Stetson disciplined for any other reason."

Mr. Cox said that of the twenty-five disciples of Mrs. Stetson who had been examined by the directors of the First Church in Boston five had been found to be in error in their teachings. Aside from the sixteen who have been admonished, there remain four about whose cases Mr. Cox said that he had not been advised. He could not say whether any of these four were slated for an admonition.

Because of the first charge which was brought against Mrs. Stetson, by the directors of the First Church of Boston a new by-law has been added to the laws of the church. This new restriction was not in effect until the Christian Science Journal was published under the caption Article XXIII. It reads:

"Recognition, Section 12.—In order to be eligible to a card in the Christian Science Journal, churches and societies are required to acknowledge as such all other Christian Science churches and societies advised in said Journal and to maintain toward them an attitude of Christian fellowship."

The first of the seven counts upon which Mrs. Stetson was disciplined reads that she had been teaching her students, or those with whom she has been holding daily meetings, that the branch church of Christ, Scientist, of Boston, is a member, is the only legitimate Christian Science Church in New York city, and she teaches her students, or said group of students, not to regard the other branches of the mother church which are in that city as Christian Science churches.

Blome of 18 West 10th street, who is one of those admonished to the extent of having his card withdrawn from the Journal, said yesterday that he would not be deterred by the action of the directors of the Boston mother church. "I shall go on preaching the gospel and healing the sick as before," said Mr. Blome, "and I shall not be prevented from doing so by the action of the directors of the Boston mother church. I cannot be interfered with by any such step as the present one. I shall adhere to Mrs. Stetson's teachings, believing, as I do, that they are the true teachings of Christian Science. The act of taking my card out of the Journal does not make it impossible for me to practice according to the gospel of Jesus Christ; it simply deprives me of the authority to do so."

"I have no idea of withdrawing from the church. Nor do I believe that others who have been admonished as I have entertain any such idea. I submit to the decision of the church authorities. While I cannot conceive of rejecting the views of Mrs. Stetson, I have availed myself of the suggestion of the directors and have examined my own mind to see if I could find therein anything counter to the teachings of Christian Science. I did not know that I was receiving teachings from Mrs. Stetson not in conformity with those of the mother church."

DOESN'T EXPECT A REPRIMAND

MINISTER CRANE TALKS ON HIS WAY TO WASHINGTON.

Says His Public Speeches Regarding His Mission Had the Approval of President Taft—Admits That He Is an Amateur in Diplomatic Customs.

MISSOURI VALLEY, Ia., Oct. 9.—Charles R. Crane of Chicago, new Minister to China, now on his way from San Francisco to Washington in response to a sudden recall on the eve of his departure for the Orient, has little fear of a reprimand at the hands of the State Department.

Replying to published reports that his recall was for the purpose of reproving him for a too free discussion of diplomatic relations between this country and China, Mr. Crane let it be known that what he has said on several occasions since his appointment was with the sanction and approval of President Taft himself.

"I am in the dark so far as concerns the nature of this recall," he said. "I got a brief message from Mr. Knox directing me to report at Washington once more before sailing for China. The telegram came on Monday. There were no two ways about it, so instead of sailing on Wednesday I started back to Washington."

"I do not think the summons is for the purpose of giving the State Department opportunity to criticize recent public utterances of mine. It is most probable that things have come up which need consultation and conference. It is generally understood that the situation in the Far East is at a delicate juncture."

"Before I left Washington affairs involving the relations of China, Japan and the United States were discussed, but not so thoroughly as at present may be considered wise."

"The papers have pointed out that Secretary Taft's custom of giving a brief repetition of such speeches as were delivered in New York, Chicago and other places after I received my appointment. Following the receipt of cordial invitations to make addresses before various organizations I went to President Taft and told him I did not consider myself fit to accept them. He told me to go ahead and do my best, and for that end I have striven. It is because I am perfectly in accord with the views the President holds with reference to the Far East that I am willing to undertake this mission. I would not feel like doing it under any other conditions."

Mr. Taft knows that I am in sympathy with the policies to which he has given his public endorsement. As I left San Francisco I learned that the President had been notified of my recall, but he too was in ignorance as to its cause. It is possible that I have made mistakes. Both the President and Mr. Knox understood that I am much of an amateur, so far as diplomatic matters are concerned. Any criticism he is in store for me upon my arrival in Washington it will of course be received in the proper spirit. There are no doubts but that the recent compact between China and Japan in regard to the reconstruction of the Antung, Mukden and South Manchurian railways was shown to the new minister. In this compact exclusive mining rights along these roads are granted to Japanese. This is considered by the State Department as opposed to the open door policy."

Mr. Crane left the station at 10:30 a. m. and will arrive in Washington at 10:30 p. m. He was accompanied by his secretary, Walter S. Jones, and Mrs. Jones. The party will leave late in the afternoon for Washington.

NEW YORK, Oct. 9.—Charles R. Crane, new Minister to China, arrived here on the Overland Limited on the North-western Railroad from San Francisco at 2:35 p. m. Three hours later he boarded a Pennsylvania train headed for Washington.

A copy of a newspaper of last Thursday containing a dispatch from Washington stating that the main reason why Mr. Crane was summoned back had to do with the open door policy and complications arising from the recent compact between China and Japan in regard to the reconstruction of the Antung, Mukden and South Manchurian railways was shown to the new minister. In this compact exclusive mining rights along these roads are granted to Japanese. This is considered by the State Department as opposed to the open door policy.

Mr. Crane left the station at 10:30 a. m. and will arrive in Washington at 10:30 p. m. He was accompanied by his secretary, Walter S. Jones, and Mrs. Jones. The party will leave late in the afternoon for Washington.

NEW YORK, Oct. 9.—Col. James Hamilton Lewis of Chicago is again in our midst. He brought with him an air of mystery, together with his famous pink whiskers and a rakish suit hat, a little trifle picked up somewhere in the course of his extensive travels. His coming was preceded by Chicago rumors that he had been summoned to the capital by Secretary of State Knox for consultation in regard to the condition of affairs in China. Incidentally it came from Chicago about the time Col. Lewis left there that Jim Hays, as those who love him best have learned to call him, would be able to throw much light on the reasons which surrounded the mysterious recall of Charles R. Crane, the American Minister to China, from San Francisco to Washington as he was about to take steamer for the Orient to assume the duties of his new post.

Col. Lewis went to the Orient toward the end of Mr. Roosevelt's term as President and returned to America and Chicago last July. His homecoming was followed by reports that he had been to China and Japan as Mr. Roosevelt's official emissary, as his secret commissioner in fact. Col. Lewis modestly declined to comment on these reports, and as far as he is concerned the business which took him to the Far East is concealed as it were in the pages of a sealed book. To-day he politely but firmly refused to talk on the subject.

"No," he declared, "I cannot say whether I went there under a commission from Roosevelt. Nobody has ever been able to find that out. However, I wrote a detailed report on the conditions I saw, and it is only fair to say that many things I prophesied in that document have come to pass."

Inquiry at the State Department as to Col. Lewis's status, past, present or future, brought forth a most emphatic denial of the reports that Col. Lewis had been in the Orient on a mission for this Government either for the Roosevelt or Taft administration. This is mentioned merely as a curious divergence from the Department's usual reticence. The Department people said that Col. Lewis had not been summoned to the forthcoming conference between Secretary Knox and Minister Crane. Col. Lewis confirmed this and paid a tribute to Mr. Crane.

"I know him well," he said. "We belong to the same club."

As for the statement that Mr. Crane would not be permitted to go to China as Minister Col. Lewis waved it away. "It is not possible—not possible!" he exclaimed.

GOT THE TOGS AWAY

Uncertainty as to the Fate of the Alleged Lucky Fisherman Daily.

JERSEY CITY, Oct. 9.—G. Murray Hulbert, a lawyer at 32 Liberty street, New York city, living at 24 Danforth avenue, Jersey City, received a call at his home last night from a sad eyed, long faced young man describing himself as Harry Hendricks of 124 East End avenue, New York city, whose clothes were dripping with sea water.

Hendricks explained that a boat in which he and his brother Herman had been fishing in New York Bay had been seized near the Statue of Liberty and "billy" was drowned. He asked the lawyer to fit him out with some dry duds and the lawyer obliged.

Hendricks then went to the Danforth avenue station of the Jersey Central Railroad, where he joined his brother Herman. A suspicious cop took both of them to the police station, because Herman's trousers were dry, although his coat was wet. The brothers said they didn't know much about the drowned sailor, but that he had been living at 457 Jackson street, College Point, where they said they guessed his home was in Long Island City.

The police suspect that the drowning of Daily was a fair tale which went into a pandering scheme to get new outfits.

OUR ACTS AUTOMATIC

Dr. Vincent Tells Chicago Teachers That Gallantry Is Not Based on Chivalry.

DOESN'T EXPECT A REPRIMAND

MINISTER CRANE TALKS ON HIS WAY TO WASHINGTON.

Says His Public Speeches Regarding His Mission Had the Approval of President Taft—Admits That He Is an Amateur in Diplomatic Customs.

MISSOURI VALLEY, Ia., Oct. 9.—Charles R. Crane of Chicago, new Minister to China, now on his way from San Francisco to Washington in response to a sudden recall on the eve of his departure for the Orient, has little fear of a reprimand at the hands of the State Department.

Replying to published reports that his recall was for the purpose of reproving him for a too free discussion of diplomatic relations between this country and China, Mr. Crane let it be known that what he has said on several occasions since his appointment was with the sanction and approval of President Taft himself.

"I am in the dark so far as concerns the nature of this recall," he said. "I got a brief message from Mr. Knox directing me to report at Washington once more before sailing for China. The telegram came on Monday. There were no two ways about it, so instead of sailing on Wednesday I started back to Washington."

"I do not think the summons is for the purpose of giving the State Department opportunity to criticize recent public utterances of mine. It is most probable that things have come up which need consultation and conference. It is generally understood that the situation in the Far East is at a delicate juncture."

"Before I left Washington affairs involving the relations of China, Japan and the United States were discussed, but not so thoroughly as at present may be considered wise."

"The papers have pointed out that Secretary Taft's custom of giving a brief repetition of such speeches as were delivered in New York, Chicago and other places after I received my appointment. Following the receipt of cordial invitations to make addresses before various organizations I went to President Taft and told him I did not consider myself fit to accept them. He told me to go ahead and do my best, and for that end I have striven. It is because I am perfectly in accord with the views the President holds with reference to the Far East that I am willing to undertake this mission. I would not feel like doing it under any other conditions."

Mr. Taft knows that I am in sympathy with the policies to which he has given his public endorsement. As I left San Francisco I learned that the President had been notified of my recall, but he too was in ignorance as to its cause. It is possible that I have made mistakes. Both the President and Mr. Knox understood that I am much of an amateur, so far as diplomatic matters are concerned. Any criticism he is in store for me upon my arrival in Washington it will of course be received in the proper spirit. There are no doubts but that the recent compact between China and Japan in regard to the reconstruction of the Antung, Mukden and South Manchurian railways was shown to the new minister. In this compact exclusive mining rights along these roads are granted to Japanese. This is considered by the State Department as opposed to the open door policy."

Mr. Crane left the station at 10:30 a. m. and will arrive in Washington at 10:30 p. m. He was accompanied by his secretary, Walter S. Jones, and Mrs. Jones. The party will leave late in the afternoon for Washington.

NEW YORK, Oct. 9.—Charles R. Crane, new Minister to China, arrived here on the Overland Limited on the North-western Railroad from San Francisco at 2:35 p. m. Three hours later he boarded a Pennsylvania train headed for Washington.